

**From:** Brian P [<mailto:newportbeachresident@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 09, 2013 10:09 AM  
**To:** Mike Henn  
**Cc:** Wisneski, Brenda  
**Subject:** Balboa Village Advisory Committee - Residential Parking Permit Program

Councilman Henn and the Balboa Village Advisory Committee

I understand that later today (October 9, 2013) the Balboa Village Advisory Committee ("BVAC") will be meeting to discuss the proposed Residential Parking Permit Program ("RPP").

As background, the September 6, 2013 Nelson/Nygaard Consulting memo stated that "[i]n Newport Beach, the primary rationale for parking management is to make parking more convenient and accessible for residents, visitors, and employees. An RPP program complements these larger goals by accommodating residential parking demand, without compromising public access to the coastline or the access needs of other visitors and residents."

For reasons stated below, I want to express my opposition to the RPP as it is currently conceived. In fact, I think the RPP as currently conceived undermines Nelson/Nygaard's above-stated rationale for parking management and will ultimately have a severe negative impact on those residents not in the zone afforded the special parking privileges of the RPP.

First, creating a situation where only residents within a specially designated district receive special parking privileges will negatively impact residents outside the special parking zones because it will force more people into "spillover" areas in search of free parking. Page 3 of the Nelson/Nygaard memo expressly acknowledged that the RPP poses a threat of "spillover into areas just outside of the boundaries of the propose[d] district..." Nelson/Nygaard's solution to this acknowledged problem is that the boundaries of the RPP may have to be adjusted to accommodate the residents in the "spillover" zones. But my concern is that if the boundaries are re-adjusted, this will merely create a new "spillover" zone which will in turn require another "adjustment."

Second, assuming the defined boundaries are not adjusted, the RPP will have a dramatic and negative parking impact on the entire Peninsula. The Nelson/Nygaard memo clearly anticipates that those outside the proposed RPP district will see "spillover" parking problems. I believe this "spillover" problem will have a ripple effect up and down the Peninsula. For example, one can very easily imagine a scenario where residents on 9<sup>th</sup> Street (just outside the proposed RPP district) will see a negative impact on their residential parking needs from the RPP, thereby forcing them to upper streets like 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, or 12<sup>th</sup> Streets. In turn, residents on 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, or 12<sup>th</sup> Streets will experience a negative parking impact from the "spillover" residents searching for parking, which will in turn, force the residents on 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, or 12<sup>th</sup> Streets to search for parking on other streets such as 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, or 15<sup>th</sup> Streets. One can easily see how the RPP in this one

specific district can quickly have a negative parking impact on a much wider area of the Peninsula.

Third, there is a Peninsula-wide parking problem. Even assuming that all of the proposed improvements the BVAC is considering are properly implemented, the Balboa Village area does not now and likely will not ever experience the more acute parking problems faced in the upper streets. The areas between 32<sup>nd</sup> Street and the Newport Pier are the zones with the highest concentration of bars, restaurants, and stores, and stand to see even more increased visitor activity when the proposed hotel on the old city hall grounds and Newport Marina projects open. For residents in these areas, all of these existing and proposed projects create a horrible parking nightmare. Creating a district for residents in the proposed RPP area where they receive special parking privileges, which in turn force “spillover” parking up the Peninsula poses a threat to areas already severely impacted with negative parking issues.

Fourth, by providing some, but not all, Peninsula residents with special parking privileges through the RPP, you diminish the entire Peninsula’s ability to demand a Peninsula-wide parking solution with one loud voice. Once the parking needs of the residents in the RPP area are accommodated, they will no longer have an incentive to call for wider parking solutions for the entire Peninsula. As anyone who has ever visited the Peninsula in the summer knows, we Peninsula residents desperately need a Peninsula-wide parking solution.

Fifth, the residents require a Peninsula-wide parking solution. In just the past few years, the City has approved a remarkable series of projects that stand to dramatically improve the quality of life for residents. The Landing shopping center has changed the face of retail on the Peninsula, the proposed Hotel will bring in very welcomed families, the Newport Marina project will offer fantastic mixed use retail and living spaces, and the Balboa Village renovations will offer the area a much needed face-lift. These projects demonstrate that the City is contemplating a Peninsula-wide approach to uplifting the quality of life for residents and visitors. Parking should be no different. To the extent parking solutions are going to be explored, they should be done on a Peninsula-wide scale. As currently conceived, the RPP will create parking solutions for a small and distinct number of residents, but will in turn, create negative parking issues for other residents. The Nelson/Nygaard memo acknowledged this reality in its discussion of “spillover” problems. Since the piecemeal approach embodied in the RPP has these clearly foreseeable negative “spillover” consequences, I encourage you to address the Peninsula-wide parking problems with Peninsula-wide solutions.

Lastly, I anticipate that the BVAC will counter many of my concerns by asserting that pay-parking spaces will be made available to offset “spillover” concerns. In anticipation of this point, I would encourage you to visit the Peninsula during a busy day. On any given busy day, and along any point on the Peninsula, you will readily see visitors “cruising” the residential streets looking for free parking. You will see this cruising through the residential streets even where pay meters are available. At page 15 of the September 2012 Balboa Village Master Plan, the BVAC acknowledged the reality that

visitors are choosing to cruise through residential streets looking for free parking despite the availability of pay parking spaces. I live near a city metered parking lot where I regularly see visitors cruising by my house anywhere from 45 minutes to an hour looking for a free spot even when there are open metered spaces just a few feet away. Therefore, I would suggest to you that the availability of more pay-parking spaces will not solve the problem of people cruising through residential streets looking for parking. Indeed, by my own observations of parking on the Peninsula, I would anticipate that the combination of creating more pay-parking spaces and the RPP in one specially designated area will actually increase cruising for free parking in residential areas that are not part of the proposed RPP.

For the reasons stated above, I would strongly urge the BVAC to reject the proposed RPP.

Regards,

Brian